Gauge invariant flow equation

C. Wetterich
Institut für Theoretische Physik
Universität Heidelberg
Philosophenweg 16, D-69120 Heidelberg

We propose a gauge invariant flow equation for Yang-Mills theories and quantum gravity that only involves one macroscopic gauge field or metric. It is based on a projection on physical and gauge fluctuations, corresponding to a particular gauge fixing. The freedom in the precise choice of the macroscopic field can be exploited in order to keep the flow equation simple.

arXiv:1607.02989v1 [hep-th] 11 Jul 2016

Functional flow equations permit to interpolate continuously from the microscopic or classical action to the macroscopic or quantum effective action. For Yang Mills theories and quantum gravity local gauge symmetries play a central role. A functional renormalization approach to such theories should keep carefully track of gauge symmetries and resulting restrictions on the general form of the effective action.

Gauge invariant exact flow equations for the effective average action of gauge theories have been formulated in the background field formalism [1–4]. This formalism has been extended to quantum gravity [5]. Approximative solutions (truncations) of the exact flow equations have been used to understand various phenomena. Superconductivity or the abelian Higgs model has been investigated in various dimensions [2, 4, 6, 7]. Increasingly sophisticated truncations in quantum chromodynamics (QCD) provide for an increasingly complete analytical understanding [8–10]. Functional renormalization has addressed the running of the gauge coupling in various dimensions [1, 3, 11–13]. Applied to thermal equilibrium, with an effective non-perturbative ("confinement") scale increasing with temperature, it has been advocated that non-perturbative strong interaction effects should be visible in the quark gluon plasma even at high temperature [1, 14]. This qualitative finding has been made quantitative by computations of thermodynamic quantities in lattice gauge theories, or by the experimental observation of strong interaction properties in heavy ion collisions at high effective temperature. Detailed studies of the flow in the non-perturbative regime have addressed the issues of the heavy quark potential [15–17], gluon condensation [18, 19], the gluon propagator [16, 17, 20] and confinement [21]. The comparison of flow equation results in Landau gauge with lattice simulations [20, 22] and Schwinger-Dyson equations [20, 23–25] have added confidence in the reliability of results for QCD. For the electroweak interactions the crossover character of the high-temperature transition has first been advocated based on the effective three-dimensional running of couplings [3].

In quantum gravity the non-perturbative flow equations for the effective average action have permitted to address the asymptotic safety scenario [26] in four dimensions [5]. The corresponding ultraviolet (UV) fixed point of the flow [5, 27] has been seen to persist for rather extended truncations [28–50]. Within dilaton quantum gravity a similar UV-fixed point can be related directly to inflationary cosmology [51, 52].

Despite many striking successful applications of functional flow equations for gauge theories there remains an important technical issue that has not yet found a fully satisfactory solution so far. It is related to the presence of two types of gauge fields - one being the macroscopic expectation value g of the microscopic fluctuating field g', $g = \langle g' \rangle$, the other the background field $\bar{g}$ employed in the formulation of the gauge fixing and the infrared cutoff. Gauge invariance of the effective action is realized only if both g and $\bar{g}$ are transformed simultaneously. While the conceptual setting and the exactness of the flow equation is not in doubt, the presence of two gauge fields makes it hard to derive series of truncations that do not rapidly become very complex.

The flowing action or effective average action $\Gamma(g, \bar{g})$ is gauge invariant if $g = \langle g' \rangle$ and $\bar{g}$ are transformed simultaneously. In contrast, gauge invariance is broken if only g' and g are transformed while $\bar{g}$ is held fixed. A gauge invariant effective action involving only one field, $\Gamma(\bar{g}) = \Gamma(\bar{g}, \bar{g})$, can be formed if g is identified with $\bar{g}$. This object is in the center of most studies in the past. The exact flow equation for $\Gamma(\bar{g})$ involves, however, the exact propagator which is encoded in $\Gamma(g, \bar{g})$ [1]. Indeed, the inverse propagator is given by the second functional derivative of $\Gamma(g, \bar{g})$ with respect to g, taken at fixed $\bar{g}$. It is not directly related to the second functional derivative of $\Gamma(\bar{g})$. What is needed is an estimate of the shape and influence of

$$\Delta\Gamma(g, \bar{g}) = \Gamma(g, \bar{g}) - \Gamma(\bar{g}, \bar{g}). \tag{1}$$

Many practical computations assume that $\Delta\Gamma$ can be sufficiently well described by a simple gauge fixing term. A reliable estimate of the effects from $\Delta\Gamma$ beyond such a simple ansatz is perhaps the most important source of uncertainty and error in the functional renormalization group approach to gauge theories.

The functional form of $\Delta\Gamma(g, \bar{g})$ obeys various constraints which guarantee that there are no physical degrees of freedom beyond the ones contained in a single gauge field. An exact "background field identity" [1] yields a one loop type equation for the dependence of the effective action on the background field at fixed g, i.e. $\partial\Gamma(g, \bar{g})/\partial\bar{g}|_g$. Modified Ward identities [53–56] account for the violation of the usual Ward identities by effects of the infrared cutoff. Both identities are exact, and the modified Ward identities can be obtained from the background field identity [57–59]. Already in a perturbative setting these identities are cumbersome to handle, and there is very little experience

how to implement these rather complex identities in a non-perturbative situation.

Alternatively, one may directly compute the flow of $\Delta\Gamma$ by an exact flow equation [60–62]. Since $\Delta\Gamma$ involves $h = g - \bar{g}$, and h transforms homogeneously as a tensor under simultaneous gauge transformations of g and $\bar{g}$, possible truncations get quickly rather involved. There are many invariants that can be constructed from the tensor h. Keeping the dependence on h and $\bar{g}$ unconstrained results in new relevant operators in the flow. The values of their coefficients have to be tuned in order to maintain consistency with the background field identity or the modified Ward identities. It is precisely these identities that are responsible for the absence of physical additional relevant couplings in the two-field formalism. Since the solutions of the identities are only poorly known, it is often difficult to achieve the physical tuning in a given truncation, resulting in potentially large errors.

In this note we propose to avoid the problems with $\Delta\Gamma(g,\bar{g})$ altogether by the definition of a flowing gauge invariant effective action $\bar{\Gamma}(\bar{g})$ which admits a closed flow equation. This means that the flow generator ζ_k (r.h.s. of the flow equation) can be expressed as a functional of $\bar{\Gamma}(\bar{g})$, typically involving the second functional derivative $\bar{\Gamma}^{(2)}(\bar{g})$. Since $\bar{\Gamma}^{(2)}(\bar{g})$ has zero modes due to gauge symmetry, the propagator for the physical modes has to be found by inversion on a suitably projected subspace. For the translation from the exact flow equation for $\Gamma(g,\bar{g})$ to the flow equation for $\bar{\Gamma}(\bar{g})$ we employ the freedom of a suitable choice of a dynamical macroscopic field $\bar{g}(g)$ in the gauge fixing and infrared cutoff term, rather than using a fixed background field $\bar{g}$. The use of a dynamical background field $\bar{g}(g)$ generalizes the standard formulation of generating functionals in terms of sources. In practice, this leads to important technical simplifications since the use of covariant derivatives involving $\bar{g}(g)$ permits the use of a gauge invariant infrared cutoff. Our formalism shows some analogies with "geometric flows" [37, 63, 64].

Flow of gauge invariant effective action

The proposed flow equation for the gauge invariant effective action $\bar{\Gamma}(\bar{g})$,

$$k\partial_k\bar{\Gamma} = \zeta_k = \pi_k + \delta_k - \epsilon_k, \tag{2}$$

involves a contribution π_k from the physical fluctuations as well as "measure contributions" δ_k from the gauge fluctuations and ϵ_k from the regularization of the Faddeev-Popov determinant. Only π_k depends on $\bar{\Gamma}$, while δ_k and ϵ_k are functions of fixed operators to be discussed later. For the physical fluctuations we propose

$$\pi_k = \frac{1}{2}Str(k\partial_k\bar{R}_P G_P), \tag{3}$$

with $\bar{R}_P$ the infrared regulator for the physical fluctuations which depends on the normalization scale k. The supertrace Str contains a momentum integration such that eq. (3) takes a one loop form.

The propagator matrix G_P for the physical fluctuations obeys the projection properties $PG_P = G_P P^T = G_P$, with projector $P = P^2$. The same holds for $\bar{R}_P = P^T\bar{R}_P = \bar{R}_P P$. The projector is defined such that the infinitesimal gauge variations of the variable $\bar{g}$ obey

$$\delta_\xi\bar{g} = (1-P)\delta_\xi\bar{g}. \tag{4}$$

(Here g is considered as a vector with index i, e.g. $g_i = A^z_\mu(x)$ or similar. Correspondingly, $P, \bar{G}_P$ and $\bar{R}_P$ are matrices.) The projector $P(\bar{g})$ depends on the macroscopic field $\bar{g}$, typically involving covariant derivatives.

We define the projected second derivative of $\bar{\Gamma}$ by

$$\bar{\Gamma}^{(2)}_P = P^T\bar{\Gamma}^{(2)}P\ ,\ \bar{\Gamma}^{(2)ij} = \frac{\partial^2\bar{\Gamma}}{\partial\bar{g}_i\partial\bar{g}_j}. \tag{5}$$

The quantity $\bar{\Gamma}^{(2)}_P + \bar{R}_P$ is invertible on the space of projected physical fluctuations. In the simplest version of the flow equation one has

$$\left(\bar{\Gamma}^{(2)}_P + \bar{R}_P\right)G_P = P^T. \tag{6}$$

Then G_P is computable in terms of $\bar{\Gamma}$, and the flow equation (2) is closed. Without the projection on physical fluctuations the matrix $\bar{\Gamma}^{(2)}$ is not invertible due to the presence of gauge modes. Extended versions of the flow equation may express G_P by a more involved functional of $\bar{\Gamma}$, for example by multiplying the l.h.s. of eq. (6) by a k-dependent normalization constant. Also a computable correction term γ_k may be added to π_k in eq. (3).

A gauge invariant effective action obeys

$$\frac{\partial\bar{\Gamma}}{\partial\bar{g}} = \frac{\partial\bar{\Gamma}}{\partial\bar{g}}P, \tag{7}$$

such that

$$\delta_\xi\bar{\Gamma} = \frac{\partial\bar{\Gamma}}{\partial\bar{g}}P\delta_\xi\bar{g} = 0. \tag{8}$$

We want to show that π_k is gauge invariant. With gauge invariant $\delta_k - \epsilon_k$ gauge invariance is then preserved by the flow.

For this purpose we assume that the regulator term for the physical modes arises from some infrared cutoff in the microscopic action,

$$\Delta S_k = \frac{1}{2}(g'_j - \bar{g}_j)\bar{R}_{ji}(\bar{g})(g'_i - \bar{g}_i), \tag{9}$$

that is gauge invariant under a simultaneous transformation of microscopic (fluctuating) and macroscopic fields g' and $\bar{g}$. This implies

$$\delta_\xi S\mathrm{tr}(\bar{R}G) = 0\ ,\ G_{ij} = \langle g'_i g'_j\rangle_c. \tag{10}$$

The projections obey

$$\bar{R}_P = P^T\bar{R}P\ ,\ G_P = PGP^T. \tag{11}$$

The gauge variation of π_k could therefore receive contributions from

$$\delta_\xi P = \Delta_P. \tag{12}$$

From the projector properties $P = P^2 = P^3$ one derives for Δ_P the relation

$$\Delta_P = \bar{P}\Delta_P P + P\Delta_P \bar{P}\ ,\ \bar{P} = 1 - P. \tag{13}$$

As a consequence of the structure of eq. (3) the factor $\bar{P}$ in Δ_P always gets multiplied by P, and with $\bar{P}P = 0$ we conclude that the gauge variation Δ_P does not contribute.

This implies

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_\xi \pi_k &= \frac{1}{2} S\mathrm{tr}\Big\{ k\partial_k \bar{R} P (\delta_\xi G) P^T \\ &\quad + k\partial_k (\delta_\xi \bar{R}) P G P^T \Big\}. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

The connected two point function involves differences between the fluctuating field and its expectation value, $g' - g$. For Yang Mills theories the inhomogeneous part of the gauge transformation drops out. Therefore G transforms linearly as a tensor, and the same holds for $\bar{R}$. (Typically, $\bar{R}$ is a function of covariant derivatives formed with the macroscopic field $\bar{g}$.) For quantum gravity both g' and g transform under infinitesimal diffeomorphism transformations as tensors, and consequently also G and R. The projector P decomposes G and $\bar{R}$ into different representations that do not mix under gauge transformations. As a result $\bar{R}_P G_P$ transforms in the same way as $\bar{R}G$ and $Str\{\bar{R}_P G_P\}$ is invariant. Finally, $k\partial_k \bar{R}$ has the same transformation property as $\bar{R}$ and we conclude that π_k is indeed gauge invariant. The measure contributions δ_k and ϵ_k are traces over functions of covariant derivatives D_μ and therefore gauge invariant as well.

For the example of non-abelian gauge theories the projector reads [1]

$$P_\mu{}^\nu = \delta_\mu^\nu - \bar{P}_\mu{}^\nu\ ,\ \bar{P}_\mu{}^\nu = D_\mu D^{-2} D^\nu, \tag{15}$$

with D_μ the covariant derivative in the adjoint representation involving the macroscopic field $\bar{g} = \bar{A}_\mu$, and $D^2 = D_\rho D^\rho$. Both δ_k and ϵ_k are traces of functions of D^2. Similarly, $\bar{R}_P$ is a function of the covariant operator

$$(\mathcal{D})_\mu{}^\nu = -D^2 \delta_\mu^\nu + D_\mu D^\nu. \tag{16}$$

For gravity the projector on physical fluctuations has been discussed in ref. [65].

We could use the flow equation (2) for an "ERGE-regularization" of a non-abelian gauge theory. Starting at some UV-scale Λ (possibly $\Lambda \to \infty$) with a gauge invariant effective action $\bar{\Gamma}_\Lambda$ the solution of eq. (2) produces a gauge invariant $\bar{\Gamma}_k$ for every scale k, including $k = 0$ where the cutoff is supposed to vanish. For appropriately chosen initial values and measure contributions this flow belongs to the same universality class as standard gauge theories.

Flow equation from functional integral

We will next discuss the emergence of the flow equation from a microscopic functional integral formulation [66]. This will be done in two steps. For the first step we keep an arbitrary field $\bar{g}$ independent of $g = \langle g' \rangle$. This closely follows ref. [1]. In the second step we choose a suitable relation $\bar{g}(g)$ which determines a single macroscopic field $\bar{g}$. Our starting point is the usual functional integral for the partition function in presence of a background field $\bar{g}$,

$$\begin{aligned} Z(L,\bar{g}) &= \int \mathcal{D}g' M_k(g',\bar{g}) \exp\big\{ -S(g') - S_{gf}(g',\bar{g}) \\ &\quad -\Delta S_k(g',\bar{g}) + L^T g' \big\}, \\ W(L,\bar{g}) &= \ln Z(L,\bar{g}). \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

The microscopic field g' may be considered as a generalized vector g'_i, with indices i including space or momentum labels, Lorentz indices μ, indices for the representations of the gauge group z, and labels for different species. For the example of a pure Yang-Mills gauge theory g' stands for the gauge fields $A'^z_\mu(x)$. The corresponding sources are denoted by $L, L^T g' = L^i g'_i$.

The microscopic action is given by $S(g')$, while the terms involving the background field are collected (for $k = 0$) in a generalized gauge fixing term $S_{gf}(g',\bar{g})$. The factor

$$M_k = M(g',\bar{g}) E_k(\bar{g}) \tag{18}$$

contains the Faddeev-Popov determinant M and an associated regulator E_k, [1] with

$$\epsilon_k(\bar{g}) = \mathrm{tr}\big\{ \ln k\partial_k E_k(\bar{g}) \big\}. \tag{19}$$

This defines the measure contribution ϵ_k in eq. (3). It may be convenient to replace M_k by an integral over ghost fields. This may lead to a modification of ϵ_k, see below. The infrared cutoff term $\Delta S_k(g',\bar{g})$ vanishes for $k = 0$. In this limit eq. (17) becomes the standard setting for a gauge theory with background gauge fixing. For $k \to \infty$ the infrared cutoff should remove the fluctuation contributions such that $\bar{\Gamma}_{k\to\infty}(\bar{g}) = S(\bar{g})$. We discuss more details below.

As usual one may define an effective action by a Legendre transform at fixed $\bar{g}$

$$\tilde{\Gamma}(g,\bar{g}) = -W(L,\bar{g}) + L^T g, \tag{20}$$

with g and L related by

$$g = \frac{\partial W(L,\bar{g})}{\partial L} = \langle g' \rangle\ ,\ L = \frac{\partial \tilde{\Gamma}(g,\bar{g})}{\partial g}. \tag{21}$$

For suitable choices of S_{gf} and ΔS_k the effective action (20) is invariant under simultaneous gauge transformations of g and $\bar{g}$.

As the key idea of this note we employ here a dynamical background field $\bar{g}(g)$ which depends on the expectation value g, rather than a fixed value. Inserting $\bar{g}(g)$ in $\tilde{\Gamma}(g,\bar{g})$ yields an effective action that only depends on one field g or $\bar{g}$. The use of a dynamical background field $\bar{g}(g)$ transmutes the defining equation for W into an integro-differential equation. Now $\partial W/\partial L$ appears in the gauge fixing term or ΔS_k and M_k through $\bar{g}(g) = \bar{g}(\partial W/\partial L)$. We will see, however, that there is no need to solve this integro-differential equation explicitly. We emphasize that the definition of $\tilde{\Gamma}(g,\bar{g})$ is the Legendre transform of $W(L,\bar{g})$ at *fixed* $\bar{g}$. One could define a different object as the Legendre

transform of $W(L) = W\big(L, \bar{g}(L)\big)$. This is not what we use here.

An exact flow equation for $\tilde{\Gamma}(g, \bar{g})$ can be derived [1] if we add to $S + S_{gf}$ an infrared cutoff term which is at most quadratic in the microscopic field g',

$$\Delta S_k(g', \bar{g}) = \frac{1}{2}(g' - \bar{g})^T R_k(\bar{g})(g' - \bar{g}). \tag{22}$$

The cutoff function R_k is assumed to vanish for $k \to 0$ and to diverge in the limit $k \to \infty$. We may write $R_k = k^n r_k$ with dimensionless r_k typically depending on ratios of suitable differential operators $\mathcal{D}$ over the appropriate power of $k, \mathcal{D}/k^m$. (For gauge fields, scalars and ghosts in four dimensions one has $n = m = 2$ and $\mathcal{D}$ will contain second covariant derivatives formed with the background field $\bar{g}$.) We require that r_k vanishes fast for large $|\mathcal{D}/k^m|$, such that ΔS_k only affects the long distance modes. For small $|\mathcal{D}/k^m|$ we assume that r_k approaches a constant. In the presence of the IR-cutoff W and $\tilde{\Gamma}$ depend on the scale k. For $k \to 0$ the cutoff vanishes and $\tilde{\Gamma}_{k=0}$ is the quantum effective action where all fluctuation contributions are included. For $k \to \infty$ the fluctuations are cut off and therefore not yet included in $\tilde{\Gamma}_k$. For an appropriate choice of R_k the saddle point approximation becomes valid, such that $\tilde{\Gamma}_{k\to\infty} = S + S_{gf}$. In a slight modification of the usual treatment the cutoff (22) acts directly on the fluctuations $g' - \bar{g}$.

The flow of $W(L, \bar{g})$ with k is given by the exact flow equation at fixed L and $\bar{g}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_k W(L, \bar{g}) - \epsilon_k(\bar{g}) &= -\frac{1}{2}\langle \partial_k \Delta S_k \rangle \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} S\mathrm{tr}\big\{\partial_k R_k (G + h \cdot h)\big\}, \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

with connected correlation function

$$G_{ij} = \langle g'_i g'_j \rangle_c = \langle g'_i g'_j \rangle - \langle g'_i \rangle \langle g'_j \rangle, \tag{24}$$

and

$$(h \cdot h)_{ij} = h_i h_j \ , \ h = g - \bar{g} = \langle g' \rangle - \bar{g}. \tag{25}$$

(The minus sign in the supertrace Str for fermions arises from the permutation of Grassmann variables.) Performing the Legendre transform (20) at fixed $\bar{g}$ results in the flow of the effective action at fixed g and $\bar{g}$

$$\partial_k \tilde{\Gamma}(g, \bar{g}) = \frac{1}{2} S\mathrm{tr}\big\{\partial_k R (G + h \cdot h\big\} - \epsilon_k(\bar{g}). \tag{26}$$

By virtue of the relation

$$\tilde{\Gamma}^{(2)} G = 1 \ , \ \tilde{\Gamma}^{(2)ij} = \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{\Gamma}(g, \bar{g})}{\partial g_i \partial g_j}, \tag{27}$$

the flow equation for $\tilde{\Gamma}(g, \bar{g})$ is closed in the two-field formalism.

In order to provide for an explicit infrared regularization of the flow we define

$$\Gamma_k(g, \bar{g}) = \tilde{\Gamma}_k(g, \bar{g}) - \frac{1}{2} h^T R_k(\bar{g}) h, \tag{28}$$

such that the second functional derivative obeys

$$\tilde{\Gamma}^{(2)} = \Gamma^{(2)} + R \ , \ G = (\Gamma^{(2)} + R)^{-1}, \tag{29}$$

and

$$\partial_k \Gamma = \frac{1}{2} S\mathrm{tr}(\partial_k R G) - \epsilon_k. \tag{30}$$

Eq. (30) has a one-loop form, with regulator R_k appearing in the propagator G according to eq. (29). For $k \to 0$ or $h \to 0$ the expressions for $\tilde{\Gamma}$ and Γ coincide.

Dynamical background field

We will investigate a suitable choice of the dynamical background field $\bar{g}(g)$ and a suitable definition of a gauge invariant effective action $\bar{\Gamma}(\bar{g})$ such that the propagator G_P for the physical fluctuations can be expressed in terms of $\bar{\Gamma}$, typically involving the second functional derivative $\bar{\Gamma}^{(2)}$. This will produce a closed form for the evolution equation of the gauge invariant effective action,

$$\partial_k \bar{\Gamma}(\bar{g}) = \zeta_k[\bar{\Gamma}]. \tag{31}$$

The exact flow equation (30) has been derived for an arbitrary background field $\bar{g}$ kept fixed. We want to translate this to a dynamical background field that is a function of $g, \bar{g} = \bar{g}_k(g)$. Here we have indicated that the relation between $\bar{g}$ and g may depend on k.

Insertion of $\bar{g}(g)$ defines an effective action $\tilde{\Gamma}(g)$ that only depends on one argument

$$\tilde{\Gamma}(g) = \tilde{\Gamma}\big(g, \bar{g}(g)\big). \tag{32}$$

If the relation between $\bar{g}$ and g is compatible with infinitesimal gauge transformations, i.e.

$$\bar{g}(g + \delta_\xi g) = \bar{g} + \delta_\xi \bar{g} \ , \ \delta_\xi \bar{g} = \frac{\partial \bar{g}}{\partial g} \delta_\xi g = \bar{P} \delta_\xi \bar{g}, \tag{33}$$

the effective action $\tilde{\Gamma}(g)$ is gauge invariant. This follows from the gauge invariance of $\tilde{\Gamma}(g, \bar{g})$ under the simultaneous transformation of g and $\bar{g}$, with

$$\delta_\xi \tilde{\Gamma}(g, \bar{g}) = \frac{\partial \tilde{\Gamma}}{\partial g} \delta_\xi g + \frac{\partial \tilde{\Gamma}}{\partial \bar{g}} \delta_\xi \bar{g} = 0 \tag{34}$$

implying

$$\delta_\xi \tilde{\Gamma}(g) = \frac{\partial \tilde{\Gamma}}{\partial g}(g, \bar{g}) \delta_\xi g + \frac{\partial \tilde{\Gamma}}{\partial \bar{g}} \frac{\partial \bar{g}}{\partial g} \delta_\xi g = 0. \tag{35}$$

This argument extends to a gauge invariant effective action $\bar{\Gamma}$ which is related to $\tilde{\Gamma}$ by subtraction of a suitable gauge invariant piece, similar to eq. (28).

The standard choice corresponding to the background field formalism would be the identification

$$\bar{g}(g) = g. \tag{36}$$

The resulting effective action $\tilde{\Gamma}(g)$ is gauge invariant. However, the first derivative of $\tilde{\Gamma}(g)$ produces no longer the source [1],

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{\Gamma}}{\partial g} = \frac{\partial \tilde{\Gamma}(g, \bar{g})}{\partial g} + \frac{\partial \tilde{\Gamma}(g, \bar{g})}{\partial \bar{g}} \frac{\partial \bar{g}}{\partial g} = L + \kappa, \tag{37}$$

with

$$\kappa = \frac{\partial\tilde{\Gamma}(g,\bar{g})}{\partial\bar{g}}. \tag{38}$$

The matrix of second derivatives contains a generalized "gauge fixing contribution"

$$Q^{ij} = \frac{\partial^2\tilde{\Gamma}(g,\bar{g})}{\partial g_i \partial g_j} - \frac{\partial^2\tilde{\Gamma}(g)}{\partial g_i \partial g_j}. \tag{39}$$

This gauge fixing contribution appears in the exact flow equation (30) for $\Gamma(g) = \Gamma(g,g)$. Since Q cannot be expressed in terms of $\Gamma(g)$ the flow of $\Gamma(g)$ is no longer given by a closed equation [1]. It involves the generating functional $\tilde{\Gamma}(g,\bar{g})$ with two arguments, which has to be determined by some assumption or approximation. This is one of the main uncertainties in the present use of approximations to the flow equation.

The choice of $\bar{g}(g)$ is not unique, however. We will investigate a suitable choice such that the flow equation for the gauge invariant effective action $\bar{\Gamma}(\bar{g})$ becomes closed. If $\bar{\Gamma}$ is gauge invariant its second derivative has zero eigenvalues. The propagator G in the flow equation (30) can therefore not be given by the inverse of $\bar{\Gamma}^{(2)}$ for $k \to 0$. We will separate the "physical fluctuations" and "gauge fluctuations" by suitable projections. On the projected space of physical fluctuations $\bar{\Gamma}^{(2)}$ will become invertible and we will express G_P by the inverse of $(\bar{\Gamma}^{(2)} + R)$ on this projected subspace, according to eq. (6).

Projection on physical fluctuations

The "macroscopic fluctuations" $h = g - \bar{g}$ can be split into "physical fluctuations" f and "gauge fluctuations" a,

$$h = g - \bar{g} = f + a. \tag{40}$$

The gauge fluctuations a obey

$$P(\bar{g})a = 0 \ , \ a = \big(1 - P(\bar{g})\big)h. \tag{41}$$

On the other hand, $P(\bar{g})$ projects on the "physical fluctuations",

$$f = P(\bar{g})h. \tag{42}$$

For infinitesimal h the gauge variation of g at fixed $\bar{g}$ can be expressed as an inhomogeneous transformation of h,

$$\hat{\delta}h = \bar{P}(\bar{g}+h)\delta_\xi(\bar{g}+h) = \bar{P}(\bar{g})\delta_\xi(\bar{g}) + \delta_h h. \tag{43}$$

The inhomogeneous part only affects the gauge fluctuations a,

$$\delta_{\rm inh} a = \bar{P}(\bar{g})\delta_\xi \bar{g}, \tag{44}$$

while f transforms as a tensor according to the linear homogeneous part $\delta_h f$. Infinitesimal gauge fluctuations a can therefore be viewed as the result of an infinitesimal gauge transformation acting only on g.

Let us write $\Gamma(g,\bar{g})$, as defined in eq. (28), in the form

$$\Gamma(g,\bar{g}) = \hat{\Gamma}(g,\bar{g}) + \Gamma_{gf}(g,\bar{g}). \tag{45}$$

We assume that the "gauge fixing term" Γ_{gf} is quadratic in the gauge fluctuations a

$$\Gamma_{gf}(g,\bar{g}) = \frac{1}{2\alpha} a^T \bar{Q}(\bar{g}) a. \tag{46}$$

We will take the limit $\alpha \to 0$ and assume that $\hat{\Gamma}$ remains finite in this limit. It will be important that no terms independent of a or linear in a diverge for $\alpha \to 0$. This selects a particular class of gauge fixing terms that are quadratic in a. Due to the divergence for $\alpha \to 0$ the term (46) is the dominant contribution to $\Delta\Gamma(g,\bar{g})$ as defined by eq. (1).

For the second functional derivative the gauge fixing term contributes a term that diverges for $\alpha \to 0$,

$$\Gamma^{(2)}_{gf} = \frac{1}{\alpha}\big(1 - P^T(\bar{g})\big)\bar{Q}(\bar{g})\big(1 - P(\bar{g})\big). \tag{47}$$

We also take an infrared cutoff of this type

$$R_k = \bar{R}_k(\bar{g}) + \frac{1}{\alpha}\big(1 - P^T(\bar{g})\big)R_{k,gf}(\bar{g})\big(1 - P(\bar{g})\big), \tag{48}$$

such that the second functional derivative of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ obeys

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\Gamma}^{(2)} \ &= \ \hat{\Gamma}^{(2)} + \bar{R}_k \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\alpha}(1 - P^T)(\bar{Q} + R_{gf})(1 - P).\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

We next decompose $\tilde{\Gamma}^{(2)}$ into four blocks corresponding to the different projections with P or $\bar{P} = (1-P)$ from left or right. The propagator G can be decomposed similarly and one finds from eq. (27), (49) for $\alpha \to 0$

$$G = G_P + \alpha\Delta G \ , \ G_P = PGP^T. \tag{50}$$

Here G_P is the inverse of $\tilde{\Gamma}^{(2)}_P$ on the projected subspace

$$\tilde{\Gamma}^{(2)}_P G_P = P^T \ , \ \tilde{\Gamma}^{(2)}_P = P^T(\hat{\Gamma}^{(2)} + \bar{R})P. \tag{51}$$

The piece $\alpha\Delta G$ vanishes for $\alpha \to 0$, and we observe that $\Gamma^{(2)}_{gf}$ and R_{gf} do not contribute to $\tilde{\Gamma}^{(2)}_P$.

In the limit $\alpha \to 0$ the flow equation (30) consists of a part involving G_P and a gauge contribution $\delta_k(\bar{g})$,

$$k\partial_k\Gamma(g,\bar{g}) = \frac{1}{2}S{\rm tr}(k\partial_k\bar{R}G_P) + \delta_k - \epsilon_k, \tag{52}$$

with

$$\delta_k = \frac{1}{2}{\rm tr}\big\{k\partial_k R_{gf}(1-P)(\bar{Q} + R_{gf})^{-1}(1 - P^T)\big\}. \tag{53}$$

The gauge contribution arises from multiplication of $\alpha^{-1}\partial_k R_{gf}$ with the appropriate projection of $\alpha\Delta G$. It depends on $\bar{g}$ via $P, \bar{Q}$ and R_{gf}, but is does not involve $\hat{\Gamma}$. This defines the measure contribution δ_k in eq. (2). We observe that for $\alpha \to 0$ only $\tilde{\Gamma}^{(2)}_P$ and the second term $\sim 1/\alpha$ in eq. (49) enter in the flow equation (52). The parts in $\tilde{\Gamma}^{(2)} - \tilde{\Gamma}^{(2)}_P$ that do not diverge for $\alpha \to 0$ are projected out and do not influence the flow. We also observe that the

leading part in $\Delta\Gamma$ is given by Γ_{gf} in eq. (46) for all k. All contributions to the flow are finite for $\alpha \to 0$ and therefore cannot change the divergent part $\sim 1/\alpha$.

We are finally interested in the flow of $\bar{\Gamma}(\bar{g})$, which is related to $\Gamma\big(g(\bar{g}),\bar{g}\big)$ by a suitable subtraction. We will choose $\bar{g}(g)$ such that $a(g) = 0$. Then $\bar{g}(g)$ is determined by specifying $f(\bar{g})$. Both δ_k and ϵ_k involve only $\bar{g}$. For the contribution π_k of the physical fluctuations one needs the evaluation of the first term in eq. (52) by inserting $g = \bar{g} + f(\bar{g})$. Furthermore, the flow at fixed $\bar{g}$ has to take into account that the relation between g and $\bar{g}$ may depend on k. This flow equation for $\bar{\Gamma}(\bar{g})$ will be closed if we can find a suitable choice of $\bar{g}(g)$ such that $\hat{\Gamma}^{(2)}$ can be expressed in terms of $\bar{\Gamma}(\bar{g})$ and its functional derivatives. Then G_P can be expressed in terms of $\bar{\Gamma}$ by solving eq. (51).

The particular form of the gauge fixing term (46) is crucial for our construction. One may add other terms that do no diverge for $\alpha \to 0$, but there should be no term linear in a that diverges for $\alpha \to 0$. Correspondingly, we employ a particular gauge fixing in the microscopic formulation (17)

$$\Gamma_{gf}(g',g) = \frac{1}{2\alpha} a'^T \bar{Q}(\bar{g}) a', \tag{54}$$

where

$$a' = \big(1 - P(\bar{g})\big)(g' - \bar{g}). \tag{55}$$

For $\alpha \to 0$ the saddle point approximation becomes exact in the sector of the gauge fluctuations and one infers eqs. (45), (46).

For the example of Yang-Mills theories eq. (54) is realized by background gauge fixing in Landau gauge

$$\Gamma_{gf} = \frac{1}{2\alpha}\int_x G^z G^*_z \ , \ G^z = \big(D^\mu(A'_\mu - \bar{A}_\mu)\big)^z, \tag{56}$$

with covariant derivative D^μ formed with the macroscopic field $\bar{A}_\mu$. With

$$\bar{Q} = -D_\mu D^\nu \ , \ \mathcal{D}_S = -D^\rho D_\rho, \tag{57}$$

and infrared cutoff for gauge fluctuations $R_{gf}(\bar{Q})$, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_k &= \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}\Big\{k\partial_k R_{gf}(\bar{Q})\big(\bar{Q} + R_{gf}(\bar{Q})\big)^{-1}\Big\} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}\Big\{k\partial_k R_{gf}(\mathcal{D}_S)\big(\mathcal{D}_S + R_{gf}(\mathcal{D}_S)\big)^{-1}\Big\}.\end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

For the Faddeev-Popov determinant

$$M = \det\big(-D^\mu(\bar{A})D_\mu(A')\big) = \det\big(\mathcal{D}_S + iD^\mu(A'_\mu - \bar{A}_\mu)\big) \tag{59}$$

we may choose the regularization

$$E_k = \frac{\det\big(\mathcal{D}_S + R_{gf}(\mathcal{D}_S)\big)}{\mathrm{Det}(\mathcal{D}_S)}. \tag{60}$$

This results in

$$\epsilon_k = 2\delta_k. \tag{61}$$

Choice of macroscopic field

We next will use the freedom in the precise choice of the macroscopic field $\bar{g}(g)$ in order to obtain a closed flow equation for a suitably defined gauge invariant effective action $\Gamma(\bar{g})$. The main idea is to express the propagator for physical fluctuations G_P in terms of the second functional derivative $\bar{\Gamma}^{(2)}$. This will determine the choice of $\bar{g}(g)$ and the precise definition of $\bar{\Gamma}(\bar{g})$.

Let us define

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\Gamma}(\bar{g}) &= \Gamma\big(g = \bar{g} + f(\bar{g}),\ \bar{g}\big) - C(\bar{g}) \\ &= \hat{\Gamma}(g = \bar{g} + f(\bar{g}), \bar{g}) - C(\bar{g}),\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

for some suitably chosen $f(\bar{g})$ and $C(\bar{g})$. This amounts to the choice $\bar{g}(g) = g - f\big(\bar{g}(g)\big)$. The second derivative of $\bar{\Gamma}(\bar{g})$ becomes

$$\begin{aligned}(\bar{\Gamma}^{(2)})^{ij} &= \frac{\partial^2\bar{\Gamma}(\bar{g})}{\partial\bar{g}_i\partial\bar{g}_j} = (\hat{\Gamma}^{(2)})^{ij}(g = \bar{g} + f,\ \bar{g}) \\ &\quad + B^{ij} - \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial\bar{g}_i\partial\bar{g}_j}.\end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

The term B^{ij} arises from derivatives of $\Gamma(g,\bar{g})$ with respect to $\bar{g}$, as well as from $\partial g_i/\partial\bar{g}_j = \delta^j_i + \partial f_i/\partial\bar{g}_j$,

$$\begin{aligned}B^{ij} &= S^{ij} + (\hat{\Gamma}^{(2)})^{mn}\left(\delta^i_m\frac{\partial f_n}{\partial\bar{g}_j} + \delta^j_n\frac{\partial f_m}{\partial\bar{g}_i} + \frac{\partial f_m}{\partial\bar{g}_i}\frac{\partial f_n}{\partial\bar{g}_j}\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{\partial\hat{\Gamma}}{\partial g_m}\frac{\partial^2 f_m}{\partial\bar{g}_i\partial\bar{g}_j}.\end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

Here we define for the $\bar{g}$-dependence of $\hat{\Gamma}$ at fixed g

$$\sigma^i(g,\bar{g}) = \frac{\partial\hat{\Gamma}(g,\bar{g})}{\partial\bar{g}_i}, \tag{65}$$

and

$$S^{ij} = \frac{\partial\sigma^i}{\partial\bar{g}_j} + \frac{\partial\sigma^j}{\partial g_i} + \frac{\partial\sigma^i}{\partial g_j} + \frac{\partial\sigma^j}{\partial g_m}\frac{\partial f_m}{\partial\bar{g}_i} + \frac{\partial\sigma^i}{\partial g_m}\frac{\partial f_m}{\partial\bar{g}_j}. \tag{66}$$

All quantities are evaluated for $g = \bar{g} + f(\bar{g}),\ a(\bar{g}) = 0$.

There is a certain freedom in the choice of $f(\bar{g})$ and $C(\bar{g})$. The only requirement is that $f(\bar{g})$ transforms as a tensor and $C(\bar{g})$ is gauge invariant, and that $P^T B P$ can be expressed as a functional of $\bar{\Gamma}$. A possible simple choice determines $f(\bar{g})$ by a solution of the differential equation

$$P_i{}^l\left(B^{ij} - \frac{\partial^2 C}{\partial\bar{g}_i\partial\bar{g}_j}\right)P_j{}^k = 0. \tag{67}$$

This allows us to replace $\hat{\Gamma}^{(2)}$ by $\bar{\Gamma}^{(2)}$ in eq. (51) and therefore to close the flow equation. The solution of eq. (67) depends on $C(\bar{g})$. Our aim is a simultaneous choice of $f(\bar{g})$ and $C(\bar{g})$ such that the flow equation remains simple.

The flow equation (52) holds for fixed g and $\bar{g}$. For the flow of $\bar{\Gamma}$ at fixed $\bar{g}$ we have to take into account that the

solution $g(\bar{g})$ according to eq. (67) will depend on k. With the definition (62) one finds for the flow of $\bar{\Gamma}$ at fixed $\bar{g}$

$$k\partial_k\bar{\Gamma}(\bar{g}) = \frac{1}{2}S\mathrm{tr}(k\partial_k\bar{R}G_P) + \delta_k(\bar{g}) - \epsilon_k(\bar{g}) + A_k(\bar{g}) - k\partial_k C(\bar{g}), \quad (68)$$

with

$$A_k(\bar{g}) = \frac{\partial\Gamma(g,\bar{g})}{\partial g}k\partial_k f(\bar{g}). \quad (69)$$

Here $\partial\Gamma(g,\bar{g})/\partial g$ has to be evaluated for fixed $\bar{g}$ at $g(\bar{g}) = \bar{g} + f(\bar{g})$, and we employ $\partial_k g_{|\bar{g}} = \partial_k f$. A possible simple choice employs

$$k\partial_k C = A. \quad (70)$$

Then the two last terms in eq. (68) vanish. This realizes the flow equation (2), (3), (6). The system of eqs. (67), (70) determines both $f(\bar{g})$ and $C(\bar{g})$. It is rather complex. Fortunately, there is no need to solve this system in practice. It is sufficient to realize that a solution exists.

Macroscopic field and "background field dependence"

We want to argue in favor of the existence of solutions to the system of equations (67), (70). For $\sigma^i = 0$ eqs. (67), (70) have the simple solution

$$f(\bar{g}) = 0\ ,\ C(\bar{g}) = 0. \quad (71)$$

This shows that non-zero f and C are related to the $\bar{g}$-dependence of $\hat{\Gamma}(g,\bar{g})$ at fixed g, and therefore to the $\bar{g}$-dependence of $W(L,\bar{g})$ at fixed L in eq. (17). The gauge fixing term does not contribute for $a = 0$. Its contribution to the second derivative (47) would be projected out in eq. (67), and we have already defined $\hat{\Gamma}^{(2)}$ without a contribution from the gauge fixing term. The relevant $\bar{g}$-dependence for σ^i can therefore only arise from $\Delta S_k(g',\bar{g})$ and

$$S_{FP}(g',\bar{g}) = -\ln M_k(g',\bar{g}). \quad (72)$$

For a better understanding of σ^i we need an expression for the $\bar{g}$-dependence of $\hat{\Gamma}$, which follows from the $\bar{g}$-dependence of W. The $\bar{g}$-dependence of $W(L,\bar{g})$ obeys

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\bar{g}_i}W(L,\bar{g}) = -\langle\frac{\partial}{\partial\bar{g}_i}(\Delta S_k + S_{FP} + S_{gf})\rangle. \quad (73)$$

With

$$\frac{\partial\tilde{\Gamma}}{\partial\bar{g}_{i\,|g}} = -\frac{\partial W}{\partial\bar{g}_{i\,|L}} \quad (74)$$

one obtains

$$\sigma^i = \langle\frac{\partial}{\partial\bar{g}_i}(\Delta S_k + S_{FP})\rangle - \frac{1}{2}f_m\frac{\partial}{\partial\bar{g}_i}\bar{R}^{mn}f_n + \bar{R}^{mi}f_i = \sigma^i_R + \sigma^i_{FP}, \quad (75)$$

with

$$\sigma^i_R = \frac{1}{2}S\mathrm{tr}\left\{\frac{\partial\bar{R}}{\partial\bar{g}_i}G_P\right\}. \quad (76)$$

The regularized Faddeev-Popov determinant typically involves some operator $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$, $M_k = \det(\tilde{\mathcal{D}})$, such that

$$\sigma^i_{FP} = \left\langle\frac{\partial}{\partial\bar{g}_i}S_{FP}\right\rangle = -\left\langle\mathrm{tr}\left\{\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\bar{g}_i}\tilde{\mathcal{D}}\right)\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{-1}\right\}\right\rangle. \quad (77)$$

While σ^i_R has a simple structure, the expression (77) is somewhat cumbersome. The presumably most efficient approach introduces explicit ghost fields and replaces $M_k(g',g)$ in eq. (17) by a functional integral over ghost fields. The effective action contains now additional ghost fields and one can follow the flow of the effective action for the ghosts explicitly by using a straightforward generalization of the flow equation. This procedure results in a more complicated form of ϵ_k, as obtained from the contribution of the ghost fluctuations. For the simplest truncation in the ghost sector ϵ_k is approximated by eq. (19), corresponding to eq. (61) for Yang Mills theories.

The part σ^i_R is proportional to $\partial\bar{R}/\partial\bar{g}_i$. It therefore vanishes for $k = 0$ where $\bar{R} = 0$. On the other hand, for large k the cutoff function $\bar{R}$ approaches a k-dependent constant. In this limit σ^i_R vanishes again. Thus σ^i_R only plays a role in the range where typical differential operators are of a similar size as the appropriate power of k.

For small σ^i we can solve the system of differential equations (67), (70) iteratively. We split

$$C = C_0 + C_1\ ,\ C_0(\bar{g}) = \frac{\partial\Gamma(g,\bar{g})}{\partial g_i}f_i, \quad (78)$$

with C_1 obeying

$$\gamma_k = \left(k\partial_k\frac{\partial\Gamma(g,\bar{g})}{\partial g_i}\right)f_i + k\partial_k C_1(\bar{g}) = 0. \quad (79)$$

For $B - C_0^{(2)}$ we observe that the second derivative of C_0 cancels the last term in eq. (64) and the two last terms in eq. (66). We define

$$\Delta B^{lk}_P = P_i{}^l\left\{\tilde{S}^{ij} + \hat{\Gamma}^{(2)im}\frac{\partial f_m}{\partial\bar{g}_j} + \frac{1}{2}\hat{\Gamma}^{(2)mn}\frac{\partial f_m}{\partial\bar{g}_i}\frac{\partial f_m}{\partial\bar{g}_j} - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^2 C_1}{\partial\bar{g}_i\partial\bar{g}_j} + (i\leftrightarrow j)\right\}P_j{}^k, \quad (80)$$

with

$$\tilde{S}^{ij} = \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial\sigma^i}{\partial\bar{g}_j} + \frac{\partial\sigma^i}{\partial g_j} - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^2\sigma^i}{\partial\bar{g}_j\partial g_m}f_m, \quad (81)$$

such that the condition (67) reads $\Delta B_P = 0$.

In lowest order we consider σ and f as small quantities in which we linearize. One obtains $\Delta B_P = 0$ for

$$\frac{\partial f_m}{\partial\bar{g}_j} = -(\hat{G}_P)_{mk}\left(\frac{\partial\sigma^k}{\partial g_j} + \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial\sigma^k}{\partial\bar{g}^j} - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^2 C_1}{\partial\bar{g}^k\partial\bar{g}^j}\right), \quad (82)$$

where

$$\hat{G}_P P^T \bar{\Gamma}^{(2)} P = P. \tag{83}$$

We may start with $C_1 = 0$, compute f_m by solving the linear differential equation (82) with suitable initial conditions, then determine C_1 for this solution from $\gamma_k = 0$, and iterate. From the linear solution higher order terms in f and σ can again be determined iteratively.

There seems to be no obstruction to find solutions to eq. (82). We simply will assume that a solution to this equation, and more generally to the system (67), (70) beyond the linear approximation, exists. Typically, a particular solution will involve an initial condition that we may take as $f(\bar{g}_0) = 0$ for some suitably chosen configuration $\bar{g} = \bar{g}_0$. Linearization in f is then expected to be valid for $\bar{g}$ in the vicinity of $\bar{g}_0$.

Quantum field equation

For a given choice of $f(\bar{g})$ and $C(\bar{g})$ we can introduce a source $\bar{J}$ by

$$\frac{\partial \bar{\Gamma}}{\partial \bar{g}} = \bar{J}. \tag{84}$$

Gauge invariance of $\bar{\Gamma}$ implies

$$P^T \bar{J} = \bar{J}. \tag{85}$$

This amounts to the usual conservation of $\bar{J}$. There is no need, however, that $\bar{J}^T$ equals precisely the projected source $J^T = L^T P$. The exact "quantum field equation" (84) is the basis of the use of macroscopic field equations for gravity or electromagnetism. The appropriate "quantum definition" of the energy momentum tensor or the electromagnetic current is given by their coupling in the quantum effective action $\bar{\Gamma}$, as defined by eq. (85).

Discussion

We propose a closed flow equation for the effective action of gauge theories that only involves one macroscopic gauge field - instead of separate fields for the expectation value of fluctuations and background field. Gauge invariance is maintained by this flow. This flow equation will be useful if $\bar{\Gamma}$ remains simple enough such that meaningful truncations can be diviced and the "initial value" at large k can be controlled. In particular, this concerns the locality properties of $\bar{\Gamma}$.

One may formally define a "correction term" to the flow, $\zeta_k = \pi_k + \delta_k - \epsilon_k - \gamma_k$, with γ_k defined by eq. (79), as well as a correction in the propagator equation (6),

$$\left(\bar{\Gamma}_P^{(2)} + \bar{R}_P + \Delta B_P\right) G_P = P^{(T)}, \tag{86}$$

with ΔB_P given by eq. (80). If solutions for $f(\bar{g})$ and $C_1(\bar{g})$ with $\gamma_k = 0, \Delta B_P = 0$ exist, as suggested by our discussion above, the flow equation (2), (3), (6), (58) is exact. If not, eqs. (2), (3), (6), (58) can be still be used as an approximation, with errors $\sim f$. (The error can be minimized by the choice of optimal f and C_1.)

Depending on the choice of $f(\bar{g})$ and $C(\bar{g})$ several versions of closed gauge invariant flow equations for $\bar{\Gamma}(\bar{g})$ can be constructed. It is sufficient that ΔB_P and γ_k can be expressed in terms of $\bar{\Gamma}(\bar{g})$. Besides gauge invariance, a simple structure and, in particular, a sufficiently local form of $\bar{\Gamma}$ are needed for devicing useful truncations. It is possible that a compromise with nonzero ΔB_P and γ_k is advantageous for locality properties, even if solutions with $\Delta B_P = 0, \gamma_k = 0$ exist. An example is a choice of f and C such that

$$\bar{\Gamma}_P^{(2)} + \bar{R}_P + \Delta B_P = P^T N^T (\bar{\Gamma}^{(2)} + \tilde{R}) N P, \tag{87}$$

where the normalization factor N could depend on $\bar{g}$. It remains to be found out which choice ensures the best locality properties of $\bar{\Gamma}$.

In practice, our approach argues in favor of the use of a particular "physical gauge fixing" that only acts on gauge fluctuations. For Yang-Mills theories this is realized by Landau gauge, e.g. eq. (56) with $\alpha \to 0$. For precise computations it seems advantageous to follow explicitly the flow of a ghost sector, computing the measure term ϵ_k from the contribution of the ghost fluctuations to the flow of the effective action, evaluated at nonzero gauge field $\bar{A}_\mu$ and vanishing ghost fields. Many computations of this type have been performed in the past in the background field formalism. They have neglected in practice the correction terms [1] arising in the two-field formalism. We argue that this neglection is justified. For $\alpha \to 0$ the gauge fixed flow equation, as employed so far, turns out to be identical to the projected flow equation (2), (3), (6), (58). Only the precise status of the macroscopic field $\bar{A}_\mu$ differs from the expectation value of the microscopic field if $f_\mu \neq 0$.

In quantum gravity the "physical gauge fixing"

$$S_{gf} = \frac{1}{2\alpha} \int_x \sqrt{\bar{g}} \left(D^\mu h'_{\mu\nu}\right)^2 \ , \ h'_{\mu\nu} = g'_{\mu\nu} - \bar{g}_{\mu\nu}, \tag{88}$$

involves the covariant derivative D^μ formed with the macroscopic metric $\bar{g}_{\mu\nu}$, and we take $\alpha \to 0$. This gauge fixing is purely quadratic in the gauge fluctuations and has been advocated as the "physical gauge fixing" in ref. [65], and used in practical computations in ref. [45]. Unfortunately, the algebraic complexity for this gauge is somewhat higher than for more popular gauges used in practical computations so far. These other gauges do not obey our criteria for the decoupling of gauge fluctuations. Corrections to simple truncations in the two-field formalism may therefore be substantial and are difficult to control [60–62]. We suggest to use the gauge fixing (88) and to employ the projected flow equation (2), (3), (6). Projections may be cumbersome in practice, but the gain of a more controlled truncation involving explicitly the physical fluctuations and being restricted by gauge symmetry outweighs this disadvantage. We hope that the proposed flow equation (2), (3), (6), (58), or variants thereof with non-zero ΔB_P and γ_k, helps to put the understanding of asymptotic safety in quantum gravity on a solid basis.

Acknowledgment: The author would like to thank H. Gies, J. Pawlowski and M. Reuter for useful comments and discussion. This work is supported by ERC-AdG-290623.

[1] M. Reuter and C. Wetterich, Nucl. Phys. **B417**, 181 (1994).
[2] M. Reuter and C. Wetterich, Nucl. Phys. **B427**, 291 (1994).
[3] M. Reuter and C. Wetterich, Nucl. Phys. **B408**, 91 (1993).
[4] M. Reuter and C. Wetterich, Nucl. Phys. **B391**, 147 (1993).
[5] M. Reuter, Phys. Rev. **D57**, 971 (1998), hep-th/9605030.
[6] B. Bergerhoff, F. Freire, D. Litim, S. Lola, and C. Wetterich, Phys. Rev. **B53**, 5734 (1996), hep-ph/9503334.
[7] B. Bergerhoff, D. Litim, S. Lola, and C. Wetterich, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A11**, 4273 (1996), cond-mat/9502039.
[8] H. Gies, Lect. Notes Phys. **852**, 287 (2012), hep-ph/0611146.
[9] D. F. Litim and J. M. Pawlowski, in *The exact renormalization group. Proceedings, Workshop, Faro, Portugal, September 10-12, 1998* (1998), pp. 168–185, hep-th/9901063, URL `http://alice.cern.ch/format/showfull?sysnb=0302190`.
[10] J. M. Pawlowski, Annals Phys. **322**, 2831 (2007), hep-th/0512261.
[11] U. Ellwanger, M. Hirsch, and A. Weber, Z. Phys. **C69**, 687 (1996), hep-th/9506019.
[12] H. Gies, Phys. Rev. **D66**, 025006 (2002), hep-th/0202207.
[13] H. Gies, Phys. Rev. **D68**, 085015 (2003), hep-th/0305208.
[14] J. Braun and H. Gies, Phys. Lett. **B645**, 53 (2007), hep-ph/0512085.
[15] C. Wetterich (1995), hep-th/9501119.
[16] C. Wetterich, Z. Phys. **C72**, 139 (1996), hep-ph/9604227.
[17] B. Bergerhoff and C. Wetterich, Phys. Rev. **D57**, 1591 (1998), hep-ph/9708425.
[18] M. Reuter and C. Wetterich, Phys. Rev. **D56**, 7893 (1997), hep-th/9708051.
[19] A. Eichhorn, H. Gies, and J. M. Pawlowski, Phys. Rev. **D83**, 045014 (2011), [Erratum: Phys. Rev.D83,069903(2011)], 1010.2153.
[20] A. K. Cyrol, L. Fister, M. Mitter, J. M. Pawlowski, and N. Strodthoff (2016), 1605.01856.
[21] J. Braun, H. Gies, and J. M. Pawlowski, Phys. Lett. **B684**, 262 (2010), 0708.2413.
[22] A. Sternbeck, E. M. Ilgenfritz, M. Muller-Preussker, A. Schiller, and I. L. Bogolubsky, PoS **LAT2006**, 076 (2006), hep-lat/0610053.
[23] C. S. Fischer and J. M. Pawlowski, Phys. Rev. **D75**, 025012 (2007), hep-th/0609009.
[24] C. S. Fischer and J. M. Pawlowski, Phys. Rev. **D80**, 025023 (2009), 0903.2193.
[25] M. Mitter, J. M. Pawlowski, and N. Strodthoff, Phys. Rev. **D91**, 054035 (2015), 1411.7978.
[26] S. Weinberg, in *General Relativity: An Einstein Centenary Survey* (1980), pp. 790–831.
[27] W. Souma, Prog. Theor. Phys. **102**, 181 (1999), hep-th/9907027.
[28] D. Dou and R. Percacci, Class. Quant. Grav. **15**, 3449 (1998), hep-th/9707239.
[29] M. Reuter and F. Saueressig, Phys. Rev. **D65**, 065016 (2002), hep-th/0110054.
[30] D. F. Litim, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 201301 (2004), hep-th/0312114.
[31] A. Codello and R. Percacci, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 221301 (2006), hep-th/0607128.
[32] P. F. Machado and F. Saueressig, Phys. Rev. **D77**, 124045 (2008), 0712.0445.
[33] A. Codello, R. Percacci, and C. Rahmede, Annals Phys. **324**, 414 (2009), 0805.2909.
[34] P. Fischer and D. F. Litim, Phys. Lett. **B638**, 497 (2006), hep-th/0602203.
[35] D. Benedetti, P. F. Machado, and F. Saueressig, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A24**, 2233 (2009), 0901.2984.
[36] A. Eichhorn and H. Gies, Phys. Rev. **D81**, 104010 (2010), 1001.5033.
[37] I. Donkin and J. M. Pawlowski (2012), 1203.4207.
[38] N. Christiansen, D. F. Litim, J. M. Pawlowski, and A. Rodigast, Phys. Lett. **B728**, 114 (2014), 1209.4038.
[39] S. Rechenberger and F. Saueressig, JHEP **03**, 010 (2013), 1212.5114.
[40] J. A. Dietz and T. R. Morris, JHEP **01**, 108 (2013), 1211.0955.
[41] A. Codello, G. D'Odorico, and C. Pagani, Phys. Rev. **D89**, 081701 (2014), 1304.4777.
[42] K. Falls, D. F. Litim, K. Nikolakopoulos, and C. Rahmede (2013), 1301.4191.
[43] D. Benedetti, Europhys. Lett. **102**, 20007 (2013), 1301.4422.
[44] N. Christiansen, B. Knorr, J. M. Pawlowski, and A. Rodigast, Phys. Rev. **D93**, 044036 (2016), 1403.1232.
[45] N. Christiansen, B. Knorr, J. Meibohm, J. M. Pawlowski, and M. Reichert, Phys. Rev. **D92**, 121501 (2015), 1506.07016.
[46] J. A. Dietz and T. R. Morris, JHEP **04**, 118 (2015), 1502.07396.
[47] M. Demmel, F. Saueressig, and O. Zanusso, JHEP **08**, 113 (2015), 1504.07656.
[48] K. Falls, Phys. Rev. **D92**, 124057 (2015), 1501.05331.
[49] H. Gies, B. Knorr, and S. Lippoldt, Phys. Rev. **D92**, 084020 (2015), 1507.08859.
[50] H. Gies, B. Knorr, S. Lippoldt, and F. Saueressig, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 211302 (2016), 1601.01800.
[51] T. Henz, J. M. Pawlowski, A. Rodigast, and C. Wetterich, Phys. Lett. **B727**, 298 (2013), 1304.7743.
[52] T. Henz, J. M. Pawlowski, and C. Wetterich (2016), 1605.01858.
[53] C. Becchi (1996), hep-th/9607188.
[54] U. Ellwanger, Phys. Lett. **B335**, 364 (1994), hep-th/9402077.
[55] M. Bonini, M. D'Attanasio, and G. Marchesini, Nucl. Phys. **B437**, 163 (1995), hep-th/9410138.
[56] M. D'Attanasio and T. R. Morris, Phys. Lett. **B378**, 213 (1996), hep-th/9602156.
[57] F. Freire and C. Wetterich, Phys. Lett. **B380**, 337 (1996), hep-th/9601081.
[58] F. Freire, D. F. Litim, and J. M. Pawlowski, Phys. Lett. **B495**, 256 (2000), hep-th/0009110.
[59] D. F. Litim and J. M. Pawlowski, Phys. Lett. **B546**, 279 (2002), hep-th/0208216.
[60] E. Manrique and M. Reuter, Annals Phys. **325**, 785 (2010), 0907.2617.
[61] E. Manrique, M. Reuter, and F. Saueressig, Annals Phys. **326**, 463 (2011), 1006.0099.
[62] D. Becker and M. Reuter, Annals Phys. **350**, 225 (2014), 1404.4537.
[63] J. M. Pawlowski (2003), hep-th/0310018.
[64] M. Demmel, F. Saueressig, and O. Zanusso, Annals Phys. **359**, 141 (2015), 1412.7207.
[65] C. Wetterich (2016), 1603.06504.
[66] C. Wetterich, Phys. Lett. **B301**, 90 (1993).